



HOMESTEAD VALLEY
PHASE II COMMUNITY PLAN MEETING
APRIL 25th, 2005
MEETING NOTES

These meeting notes are not a transcript or verbatim record of the dialogue that occurred at the community meeting. These notes are intended to capture, to the best of our ability, a summary of the discussion that occurred during the Open Discussion portion of the meeting, including comments and questions from the public and responses from County staff (and their representatives) that were provided during the meeting.

Question #1 The Community Plan should emphasize common priorities for the community, which means compromising and finding a balance between varying interests that may exist within the community. Do you feel that the common priorities that were presented are shared by yourself and the community? If not, which priority(s) do you feel is not shared and why?

Public Comment:

There are those within the community who may not agree with maintaining the rural land use districts and would like to push for intensified development, how does the Community Plan address this?

County Response to Comment:

The Community Plan addresses intensification through goals and policies that require a thorough review of any proposed changes to the Land Use Policy Map. There is little need for increased densities since the current Land Use Policy Map can accommodate a significant amount of growth through its rural districts.

Public Question:

Lack of density is accompanied by lack of services, how is that dealt with?

County Response to Question:

The goals and policies of the Community Plan require that adequate levels of service be provided; however, most people who choose to live in rural areas recognize that service levels

are not going to be comparable with those provided in urban areas.

Public Question:

What about private roads and their dedication to the county?

County Response to Question:

It is a county wide problem because of the patchwork nature of dedication in rural areas and the fiscal constraints of the County. Public Works is working on resolving this issue, but it is not an issue that will be resolved or addressed by the Community Plans.

Public Question:

How can we get law enforcement to service private roads in response to OHV problems?

County Response to Question:

The County is currently working on an ordinance for OHV control. People that sign the registration list will be informed of its progress.

Public Question:

In the area that is proposed to be re-designated from RL-5 acres to RL-2.5 acres, will it be easier to subdivide?

County Response to Question:

Yes, the change from RL-5 to RL-2.5 would mean that the minimum lot size for the parcels in this area would be 2.5 acres; therefore, general plan amendments would no longer be necessary to subdivide down to 2.5 acres.

Public Question:

What will happen with the RS areas (N of Buena Vista, W of Indio, E of Avalon), where lot sizes are smaller than 2.5 acres (1 acre to 1.5 acres)?

County Response to Question:

Those areas that are currently designated RS will remain the same designation. No changes are proposed to these areas. The RS areas represent approximately 2% of total plan area. The RS lots have been zoned appropriately in order to maintain conforming uses throughout the area.

Public Question:

Will there be adequate water for the area?

County Response to Question:

The water issue is complex and obtaining a complete picture of long term water availability is difficult. The water districts are charged with ensuring an adequate water supply, and the Community Plan supports this through goals and policies that require adequate water supply and infrastructure to be in place or assured prior to development. The availability of water through the state water project also helps the situation within the plan area by recharging area aquifers.

Public Question:

Will water districts ever merge?

County Response to Question:

The community plan supports cooperation between water districts, but it is ultimately up to the public and the individual water districts to decide on these matters.

IN SUM: THE COMMUNITY AGREED THAT PRIORITIES ARE SHARED

Question #2 The following priorities were identified relative to protection of the rural character:

- *To maintain the predominance of low-density residential development*
- *To allow limited commercial and industrial development*
- *To protect the plan area's natural resources and scenic qualities*
- *To ensure the availability of adequate services and infrastructure to serve development*
- *To preserve open space and enhance recreation opportunities*

Do you feel the plan adequately addresses these priorities? If not, do you have specific suggestions on how these priorities could be better addressed?

Public Question:

Goals and policies are not very useful if adequate law enforcement or code enforcement is not provided to achieve these goals and policies, which is ultimately a matter of money.

County Response to Question:

This has been recognized in the Community Plan through an Implementation Schedule that has been included in the Appendix. The Implementation Schedule is a tool to be used by the County to assign responsibility to appropriate departments and agencies and consider time frames for implementation of

these goals and policies contingent upon an annual review of the budget.

Public Question:

What about trucks and traffic on 247?

County Response to Question:

Since SR-247 is a State highway, it is under the jurisdiction of the State to improve and maintain; however, the Community Plan encourages coordination with the State and addresses improvements that would avoid additional burdens on SR-247.

Public Question:

What are the provisions of the OHV ordinance?

County Response to Question:

The County is looking at options through zoning, noise, dust and nuisance approaches. Also, the ordinance should address street legal vehicles on county roads. Green Tags on designated roads and trails. No OHV use in residential areas.

Public Question:

What about the proposal for an OHV development adjacent to Homestead Valley within the Town of Yucca Valley?

County Response to Question:

The Town of Yucca Valley requires a CUP, so public meetings will be held. Residents are encouraged to attend these public meetings to voice their concerns being aware that ultimately, the Town makes the final decision. Ensuring that an Environmental Impact Report (rather than a Negative Declaration) is filed will require that a more detailed analysis and review of the various environmental impacts including noise, pollution, etc. are carried out.

Question #3 Are there any Goals or Policies included within the community plan that you feel are not consistent with these priorities? If so, which one(s), and what about the goal(s) and/or policy(s) is inconsistent?

NO RESPONSES